

REMARKS

Claims 3-7, 9-16, 18-23, and 25 are pending. Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 19 stand objected to for informal matters. In response, claims 7 and 19 have been amended as suggested.

II. 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-7, 9-15, 18-23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 5,618,602) in view of WO 96/27721. The Office Action concedes Nelson fails to teach each feature of the claims, for which purpose WO '721 is apparently cited.

The Office Action states, "Nelson fails to disclose that the at least one guiding wedge comprises a plurality of guiding wedges arranged perpendicular to the joint," but asserts "Martensson teaches, guiding wedges 9 arranged perpendicular to the joint." However, the Office Action fails to explain the distinction between the structures of Nelson and WO '721. In other words, the Office Action realizes Nelson does not teach the claimed feature, but the Office Action does not explain how the description on WO '721 teaches the claimed feature.

The present claims recite that the guiding wedge include "a section extending from said distal angled section to said core." Even if the snapping webs 9 of WO '721 were "arranged" as recited, such snapping webs 9 do not have a "a section extending from said distal angled section to said core." Thus, the snapping web 9 of WO '721 is not the equivalent of the presently claimed guiding wedge. There is neither a teaching nor suggestion in the cited art to perform such a modification.


However, as previously presented, WO '721 does *not* provide any teaching, description or suggestion to provide a plurality of guiding wedges "arranged perpendicular to the extension of

the joint.” As can be seen from Fig. 2 of WO ‘721, the snapping wedges 9 extend (i.e., are arranged) in a direction *parallel* to the joint between the panels.

Thus, the snapping webs 9 of WO ‘721 cannot be “arranged” as presently claimed.

Applicants note that the Office Action actually states “The applicant argues that the

Fig. 2



Martensson guiding wedges (9) are arranged parallel to rather than perpendicular to the *boards*” (Page 8) (emphasis added). Although Applicants explained that this is a mischaracterization of both Applicants’ arguments and the present claims in the previously filed amendment, and that the claims recite that guiding wedges are perpendicular to the plane defined by the *extension of the joint*, not the boards. The most recent Office Action repeats, *verbatim*, the error from the Office Action of October 21, 2005. Thus, it appears the argument (including the footnote) on page 8 of the most recently filed amendment was overlooked.

As neither Nelson nor WO '721 teaches nor suggests to provide the guiding wedges as presently claimed, Applicants respectfully submit that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made. Reconsideration is respectfully suggested.

III. Claim 24

The Office Action Summary lists claim 24 as being rejected. However, claim 24 was cancelled with the amendment filed on February 21, 2006. Thus, claim 24 is not pending and should not have been rejected.


IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections are overcome. Thus, entry of the above amendments and passage of the application to allowance are respectfully requested.

Moreover, as at least part of the previously filed amendment was apparently not considered, Applicants respectfully submit that (in addition to the reasons explained above) Applicants should be entitled to entry of this amendment and consideration of the remarks presented herein as if the Office Action of April 25, 2006 were a non-final Office Action.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR/mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 30887CIP2
STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20005-2477
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: July 11, 2006